

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING

EESB Snoqualmie Room
Wednesday, December 18, 1996
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

I. WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

Lloyd Piper opened the meeting. He stated that the Site's technology needs are very important and we should focus on how to present them to industry. He also mentioned that the January meeting will be an important meeting since we will be doing our annual self-assessment. John Wagoner will be meeting with Clyde in January, so if there are items you would like discussed at that meeting, send them to Shannon or Lloyd. Lloyd also stated that the Hanford Strategic Plan is out.

Shannon gave a few brief updates:

- January's self-assessment meeting will include discussions on STCG accomplishments, key issues from the Communications Ad Hoc Committee, feedback on the needs process, agenda setting, and what the STCG wants to focus on.
- There will be two NAS subcommittee meetings in January. The first will focus on TWRS and will be held at the Red Lion Hanford House on January 7-8. The second meeting is to discuss the STCG and TFA decision-making processes will be held on January 9-10.

Jim Hanson gave an update on the SubCon Subgroup and the Focus Area. In Situ Redox will be peer reviewed at Hanford in early February. Jim also expects a call for proposals to be issued by the Focus Area in the January/February time frame.

Shannon asked for introductions around the room. She then stated the meeting purpose: to reach consensus on Hanford's high-priority technology needs for submittal to the National Focus Area Teams the first week of January.

John LaFemina gave an update on the science needs process. Preproposals for EMSP are due on January 15, 1997. The full proposals are due on April 15, 1997. Somewhere between April 15 and October 1, the funding decisions will be made and the funding will be distributed. There does not seem to be a clear commitment on how the EMSP will use our science needs information. Discussion was held on the quality of the science needs and if they should be submitted in the current format. It was decided that the science needs should be revised before sending them to the EMSP. A committee was formed to review the updated needs as soon as they are finished.

II. TANK TECHNOLOGY NEEDS PRESENTATION

Cathy Louie presented the tank technology needs for 1997. The following comments were recorded:

- Tank write-ups need to be updated with Site priority rankings (H, M, L).
- DST Corrosion Monitoring need - Tom Engel (UW) was concerned about the experimental design not measuring all the realistic corrosion mechanisms (e.g., tank seams). Write-up should be modified; there have been corrosion probes in Hanford tanks.
- Information missing on names and phone numbers.
- Time reductions not shown.
- Science needs require better write-ups.
- 10,000 year time frame not appropriate; haven't been able to track Cs movement beneath tanks over ~40 years.
- Microgeology of site and physical properties should be studied rather than building another model.
- SST leakage - how big a problem will this be? Should be a science need.
- Information provided to industry - Cost savings? Baseline technology to beat. Need good problem and need definitions, as well as time targets for technology solutions.
- Ongoing S&M costs and overheads - these are large potential mortgage reductions.
- Science needs - should they focus on the critical path or alternatives? Do we know what the critical path is for TWRS?
- How much waste will be left behind and in what form? Performance Assessment (PA) work is very important.

The technology needs, with the above revisions, received approval by the Management Council to be forwarded to industry and the Focus Areas.

III. SUBCON TECHNOLOGY NEEDS PRESENTATION

Dennis Faulk presented the SubCon technology needs. The following comments were recorded:

- First need presented - page 2 says there is no regulatory requirement, but there is a regulatory need (Dirk Dunning, ODOE).
- Check that technology justifications are correct (in situ vs. ex situ).
- Distribute needs to broader federal sector (e.g., DoD).
- Next meeting - be sure to discuss communications with DoD and other federal agencies.
- When needs are passed to another Subgroup for scoring, a technical expert should attend the scoring meeting to explain the needs.
- Long-life barrier testing should be continued beyond FY98 (perhaps for decades?). Change write-up to encourage EM-50 to extend the funding. EM-40 doesn't have the funds. How about EM-30 and EM-60? It is a very important technology need for all of them.
- We need subsurface barriers, too; why aren't they on the list? Possibly because they provide an alternative in situ remediation technique. Also needed for tank leak mitigation systems.
- In situ remediation of Sr-90 in groundwater - tell EM-50 why it's a need, but the specific technology was not supported last month. Discuss in next meeting. Make clear in letter to Subcon Focus Area. Need is for retrieval rather than immobilization (e.g., Clino barrier).
- Send needs out to stakeholders early.
- Don't test technologies in sensitive areas.
- Don't do harm by adding chemicals. Stakeholders may object. Must work through the issues with stakeholders.
- Science need regarding buried cultural concerns - not really a science need. Same as technology need.
- DNAPLs - there are science needs here to be fleshed out.
- Most of the science needs are really technology needs. Change write-ups. There is a disagreement on this. We're looking for science focused on cleanup needs. Science needs support Subgroup technology needs to solve problems.

The Subcon technology needs, with the above revisions, received approval by the Management Council to be submitted to industry and the Focus Areas.

IV. MIXED WASTE TECHNOLOGY NEEDS PRESENTATION

Joe Waring presented the Mixed Waste technology needs. The following comments were recorded:

- First need - We want to characterize and immobilize waste - fix write-up.
- Second need - Can write-up be more quantitative? Is this covered in the table on the next page?

The Mixed Waste needs, with the above revisions, received approval from the Management Council to be distributed to industry and the Focus Areas.

V. D&D TECHNOLOGY NEEDS PRESENTATION

Jackie Vander Veen presented the D&D technology needs. The following comments were recorded:

- Look at buildup of CO₂ in masks as a key cause of increased stress.
- Roofing needs seem strange. Problem is we need 75-year life, low-maintenance. Roofing industry does this already. We don't have to develop this technology, just find solutions to needs. For example, sprayable polyurea roofing material is guaranteed 30-50 years. Subgroup should investigate this technology.
- Issue to discuss at future meeting - If a technology solution exists to meet a high-priority need, does the program have funds available to deploy it? Or will they continue to follow their baseline? Are funds correlated with high-priority needs?
- Some of the early D&D needs contain too many sub-needs. Need to tell vendors that they don't have to find a solution to all the specific needs.
- Turbidity in N-Basin is not a technology need. Get a chemist to solve this operations problem.
- Roofing need and basin visibility need shouldn't be sent to the D&D Focus Area?
- Subset of needs should be flagged to go to industry. Screen then next year.
- D&D needs should include cultural drivers.

- Categories of needs identified by Ecology include technology needs, operations needs, and science needs.
- Cover letter - not all needs included in the package are technology development needs. Send to FETC Industry Programs rather than the main Focus Area?

The D&D technology needs, with the above revisions, received approval from the Management Council for distribution to industry and the Focus Areas.

VI. WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be held on January 15, 1997 from 8:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

Future Agenda Items

- ⇌ Self Assessment - January
- ⇌ Communication Issues - January
- ⇌ How Agenda is Set - January
- ⇌ Valley of Death
- ⇌ Culture Change Implementation
- ⇌ Asbestos Conversion Unit Results
- ⇌ Deployment Center Update
- ⇌ Technology Management Process
- ⇌ Site Technology Planning Group (life-cycle costs)
- ⇌ Annual Budget Cycle

List of Handouts

- ⇌ Meeting Agenda
- ⇌ Summary Evaluation from November 1996 Meeting

- ⇒ Hanford Strategic Plan
- ⇒ Memo on EMSP Electronic Discussion Forum

Actions

- Need better descriptions/write-ups for the science needs.
- Update on how our needs are being examined by other federal agencies.
- Letter to EMSP stating our intent to submit proposals.